

**Draft Summary of the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
October 9, 2001**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted a meeting for the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group on October 9, 2001 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Flip Chart Notes
Attachment 4	Issue Sheet Definitions
Attachment 5	Draft Sorting/Identified Issues & Overall Licensing Process
Attachment 6	Draft Study Plan Template with Descriptions
Attachment 7	Draft Land Use Study Plan

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group meeting and objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees with their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Meeting flip chart notes are included as Attachment 3.

Action Items – August 14, 2001 Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group Meeting

A summary of the August 14, 2001 Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

- Action Item #LU18:** Provide the specific FERC guidelines and regulations regarding Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics.
- Status: Mark Greenig, EDAW, reported that the FERC guidelines and regulations regarding Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics contained within the FERC Hydroelectric Project Relicensing Handbook are driving study plan development in this Work Group. The only exception is the Fuel Management Plan that follows California Department of Forestry (CDF) guidelines.
- Action Item #LU19:** Review LM3 and R5 to determine if one could replace the other. Report back to the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group September meeting.
- Status: Jim Martin reported that he had discussed both Issue Sheets with Dale Hoffman-Floerke and Doug Rischbieter, DWR's Resource Area Managers (RAMs) for Recreation and Socioeconomics. They all agreed that for now, the two would be developed as separate plans, however careful coordination would be required and one of the two Work Groups would likely be identified as the Study Plan lead. Jim's primary concern was that the linkages between the two be identified and managed. To that end, he reported that all of the RAMS would hold a coordination meeting shortly where they will hammer out the details of study plan coordination needs for all of the Work Groups.

Action Item #LU20: Develop a 'straw person' study plan for Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group review.

Status: A draft study plan will be discussed as part of this agenda.

Action Item #LU21: Prepare draft study plans for Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group review.

Status: Jim Martin reported that a draft Study Plan would be reviewed at this meeting. The Study Plan Task Force is drafting the remaining Study Plans.

Carryover Action Items

Action Item #LU6: Provide definitions of Issue Sheet and other commonly used terms and examples to the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group.

Status: Jim Martin distributed Issue Sheet Definitions and explained that the list includes both Issue Sheet terms. He added that the list would be distributed to all Work Group participants as well as posted on the relicensing web site and would be updated with new definitions as required. The Issue Sheet Definitions are appended to this summary as Attachment 4.

Review Study Plan Template

Issue Sheet to Study Plan Graphic

Jim Martin distributed a graphic that outlines the process for developing Study Plans from Issue Sheets. The graphic includes categories of studies that should be implemented during the first or second year of studies, the disposition of issues not studied as part of the relicensing process, and the integration of study results and issues not studied as solutions or settlement agreements. The graphic is appended to this summary as Attachment 5. Jim emphasized that issues identified as being beyond the scope of the relicensing effort could be evaluated and studied by other organizations or coordinated efforts. For example DWR, with responsibilities for project land stewardship, could approach any proposed fuel management using a variety of guidance documents including the recently acquired California Fire Plan to address fuel load management issues within the Project boundary and adjacent lands. However, cooperative fuel and fire management on a larger geographic scope would require a coordinated effort among all the affected property owners and managers including agencies like CDF and the U.S. Forest Service (USFS). That type of coordinated effort would produce a more detailed and comprehensive approach to regional wildland fire and fuel management than will be developed during the relicensing effort.

One participant asked if DWR would be coordinating with other responsible agencies as a result of the recent Poe Fire. Jim Martin responded that the information gathered from the Poe Fire would be evaluated as part of the proposed Fuel Load Management study. He added that large-scale and hot wild land fires could have negative impacts to a variety of resources in a watershed including water quality, sediment loading and slope erosion, recreational activities, soil productivity, and view sheds. Jim stated that CDF's report on the Poe Fire could be added as a resource for the Fuel Load Management study.

Rob MacKenzie representing Butte County suggested the Issue Sheet to Study Plan graphic would be useful in explaining the Study Plan process to the public and requested an electronic version from DWR for that purpose. Jim Martin agreed to provide him with a copy.

Study Plan Template

The Facilitator distributed a draft template describing the elements of a study plan. The handout included examples for two generic studies. She emphasized that the sample studies did not contain the level of detail of an actual study plan, but that the sample would help clarify the relationships between issue sheet and study plan elements. She pointed out how the study plan identifies coordination among the Work Groups that may include the timing and distribution of information between studies. She explained how output from one study might be input to another

study. For example, the Fuel Load Management study I could rely on input from a botanical inventory conducted as part of an Environmental Work Group study. She added that the Engineering and Operations Work Group was developing a flowchart showing the information flow between the various studies.

One participant suggested that the template could be expanded to identify the Work Group responsible for study management when issues overlap with multiple resource areas. The participants agreed this would be helpful if added.

The draft Study Plan Template with Descriptions is appended to this summary as Attachment 6.

Study Plan List

At their previous meeting, the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group tasked DWR Staff and the Consulting Team to compile a list of studies based on the Issue Sheets developed by Work Group participants. Mark Greenig of the Consulting Team identified five studies for Study Plan development. The five Study Plans are:

1. Land Use (existing and potential land uses)
2. Land Management (existing land management policies, challenges, and coordination with other land management entities)
3. Consistency with Comprehensive Plans Evaluation (compatibility and consistency with local and/or regional plans)
4. Aesthetics (existing conditions, view shed examination, Project impacts to visitors' experience)
5. Fuel Load Management (review and evaluation of existing fuel load management plans, existing fuel loading within Project boundary and adjacent lands, integration with other management entities)

Coordination Between Work Groups

The Facilitator reported that there are several tools to assist with study plan coordination between the Work Groups. The first is through the integrated study plan matrix which shows where study plans share information. The second is through informal discussions between the technical staff that are preparing the individual study plans. The third is through the Resource Area Managers who meet on a regular basis to discuss study plan development.

One participant asked if overlapping study plan elements could inadvertently result in the loss of one group's issues or resource goals. Jim Martin responded that while one Work Group would be taking the lead in study plan development, the other Work Groups would not be left out. He added that coordination between the studies would include identifying areas where one study can serve two purposes. For example, recreation surveys can include questions regarding aesthetics or handicap accessibility that could benefit this group's efforts to describe facility use and access.

Draft Study Plans

Mark Greenig provided participants with an overview of the draft Land Use Study Plan. He explained that the plan was based on information from Issue Sheets developed by the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group. He added that Craig Jones representing the State Water Contractors had provided comments on the original draft, resulting in the identification of Phase 1 and Phase 2 activities. The phases would help distinguish between information needs (Phase 1) and evaluation and analysis of data (Phase 2). The draft Land Use Study Plan is appended to this summary as Attachment 7.

One participant asked if the Study would include review of the Butte County General Plan and other regional planning documents. He stated that Butte County is interested in integrating their planning efforts with Oroville Project facilities planning. Mark Greenig responded that all area

plans would be included in the data search. Rob MacKenzie added that it is important to keep local policy makers, as well as the public, in the Study Plan process loop. Mark responded that local governments would be part of the review process as the study plans are being evaluated.

Vince Wong representing Zone 7 Water Agency asked if the Land Use Study Plan is linked to Study Plan #3 (Compliance/consistency with other Comprehensive Plans). He suggested that if Study Plans 1, 2, and 3 are closely linked, they could be combined into one study to save money and provide better coordination. Mark Greenig responded that keeping the studies separate would allow for more specific task and staff management, but it is possible that the same consultant could be tasked to do all three studies as sub-tasks of a general Lands Plan.

One participant asked about the status of the GIS being developed for the relicensing effort. Jim Martin responded that the GIS staff in the Northern District Office continue to develop the relicensing GIS and that there is an internal web site available now. He added that some of the GIS products are available in draft but release of these products is a slow process since each GIS product must be reviewed and approved prior to distribution and use. Bill Mendenhall of DWR, Northern District, is the contact person for the GIS effort.

Referring to Phase 2, Task 2, Vince Wong asked if new issues developed during the scoping process would be included in Study Plans. He also asked if the Work Group or Study Plan Task Force would make the final decision to include a new issue. The Facilitator responded that new issues would be distributed to the appropriate Work Group, who will forward them to the appropriate Study Plan Task Force. The Study Plan Task Force (or the Work Group) will determine if the issue is addressed in an existing study or whether a new study is needed. Once revised, the specific Study Plan will be forwarded to the Plenary Group with an explanation of how the issue has been dealt with. She emphasized that the process needs to be transparent to satisfy the participants that their issues are being addressed. She added that issue tracking is critical to this process.

Rob MacKenzie asked that DWR provide a clear statement (or graphic) to all the Work Groups explaining how comments identified in this process will be handled. The facilitator responded that a graphic explaining issue management has been developed and is in Scoping Document 1.

One participant asked who would have the responsibility for crafting recommendations once the study information has been gathered (e.g. the siting of a recreation facility). The Facilitator responded that the Work Groups would provide proposals for Plenary Group's consideration. The participant asked how conflicts between resource areas would be mediated or resolved. The Facilitator responded that the Process Protocols include provisions for conflict resolution. Additionally, the ALP is designed to get conflicting interests on the table early so they can be resolved by the collaborative and minimize any last minute surprises. This includes conflicts that may arise with agencies that have mandatory conditioning authority, or the recognized tribes that have sovereign status. One participant asked if the consultants could bring potential recommendations to the Work Group to gauge the response, get feedback, and identify potential conflict. The Work Group would then be able to weigh the merits of the proposal and develop a final recommendation. The group agreed this was a strategy to consider.

The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group agreed to reconvene the Study Plan Task Force to continue development of the remaining Study Plans. Mark Greenig agreed to distribute drafts for the remaining study plans to Task Force members before the Task Force meeting.

The Facilitator reminded participants that NEPA Public Scoping meetings are planned for the evening of October 29th from 6-9pm at The State Theater in Oroville and the afternoon of October 30th from 1-4 pm at The Secretary of State Auditorium. She also reminded participants that were

planning on attending the site visit during the day on October 29th that they must RSVP to 1-866-820-8198. Additional information on the meetings is posted on the relicensing web site.

Next Meetings

The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Study Plan Task Force agreed to meet on:

Date: Monday, October 22, 2001
Time: 1:00 to 5:00 PM
Location: To be determined

The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group agreed to meet on:

Date: Tuesday, November 13, 2001
Time: 6:00 to 10:00 PM
Location: To be determined

Agreements Made

1. The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group agreed to convene the Study Plan Task Force to finish the remaining Study Plans for review at their next meeting.

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

Action Item #LU22: Obtain a copy of the CDF report on Poe Fire as Existing Information for Fuel Management Study.
Responsible: DWR Staff
Due Date: Pending availability

Action Item #LU23: Provide Rob MacKenzie with an electronic copy of the Draft Sorting/Identified Issues & Overall Licensing Process.
Responsible: DWR Staff
Due Date: October 23, 2001

Action Item #LU24: Amend Study Plan Template to include a designation for Study Lead (Work Group managing study).
Responsible: DWR Staff
Due Date: October 22, 2001

Action Item #LU25: Clarify process for incorporating comments from scoping process into study plans.
Responsible: DWR Staff/Consulting Team
Due Date: November 13, 2001